

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/529,612	03/30/2005	Kenneth Andrew Hughes	BA9313USPCT	1740
	7590 12/13/2007 Jemours & Company	EXAMINER		
E I du Pont de Nemours & Company Legal Patents			QAZI, SABIHA NAIM	
Wilmington, DE	E 19898	•	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			1616	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/13/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/529,612	HUGHES ET AL.				
• Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Sabiha Qazi	1616				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was a silicated to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 Ju	ılv 2007.	·				
,	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-15</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>13-15</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) 13-15 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers	•					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 1) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	5) Notice of Informal P					

Art Unit: 1616

Non-Final Office Action

Claims 1-15 are pending. No claim is allowed at this time. Claims 13-15 are withdrawn from consideration as non-elected invention. Elected invention is Group III and elected species is compound 2.

Summary of this Office Action dated Saturday, October 27, 2007

- 1. Information Disclosure Statement
- 2. Copending Applications
- 3. Specification
- 4. Double Patenting Rejection
- 5. Response to Remarks
- 6. Communication

Art Unit: 1616

Information Disclosure Statement

The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

Copending Applications

Applicants must bring to the attention of the examiner, or other Office official involved with the examination of a particular application, information within their knowledge as to other copending United States applications, which are "material to patentability" of the application in question. MPEP 2001.06(b). See Dayco Products Inc. v. Total Containment Inc., 66 USPQ2d 1801 (CA FC 2003).

Specification

The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or

Art Unit: 1616

improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

- 2. Claims 1-12 rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the compounds disclosed in U.S. Patent No. 6,965,032. The reference teaches substituted dihydro 3-halo-1h-pyrazole-5-carboxylates. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the compounds of formula III in column 2 which are structurally similar to the claimed compounds. See also column 26, formula III and the abstract. Claims are read in the light of specification. Based on the disclosure of US '032 instant invention would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time invention was filed.
- 3. In this case assignee is same.

Response to Remarks

Applicant's response has been fully considered and was found persuasive therefore compounds containing W = C or N has been included.

Art Unit: 1616

In order to advance the prosecution applicant may consider calling the examiner to discuss the

issues surrounding this application.

Communication

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Sabiha Qazi, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-272-0622.

The examiner can normally be reached on any business day.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Johann Richter, Ph.D. can be reached on 571-272-0646. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SABIHA QAZI, PH.D PRIMARY EXAMINER

Page 5